UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,511	07/03/2006	Reiner Fischer	2400.0170000/SRL	, 3449
	7590 05/30/200 SLER, GOLDSTEIN &	EXAM	EXAMINER	
1100 NEW YO	RK AVENUE, N.W.	ETOXT.L.L.C.	HAVLIN, ROBERT H	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1609	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/564,511	FISCHER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Havlin	. 1609	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D/ Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a rep will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH, cause the application to become ABAR	ATION. y be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this commu	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 July</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice of the practice	action is non-final.	· ·	erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-14,16,18-21 and 23 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☑ Claim(s) 1-14, 16, 18-21, and 23 are subject to	wn from consideration.	requirement.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance ion is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Apprity documents have been re u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

Art Unit: 1609

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-14, 16, 18-21, and 23 are currently pending. Claims 1-7, 9, 16, 18-21, and 23 were amended. Claims 15, 17, and 22 were cancelled.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-6, 13, drawn to a compound of formula (I). An election of species is further required.

Group II, claim(s) 7, drawn to a method of making the compound of Group I. An election of the species made and the specific reactants used is further required.

Group III, claim 8, drawn to a product of formula (III). An election of species is further required.

Group IV, claim 9 and 10, drawn to a product of formula (IV) or (IV-a). An election of species is further required.

Group V, claim 11, drawn to a product of formula (V). An election of species is further required.

Group VI, claim 12, drawn to a product of formula (XVIII). An election of species is further required.

Group VII, claim 14, 16, drawn to a method of using a product of Group I. An election of species is further required.

Group VIII, claim 18-20, drawn to a composition comprising a product of Group I and a second active ingredient. An election of species of Group I and a second ingredient is further required.

Art Unit: 1609

Group IX, claim 21 and 23, drawn to a method of using a product of Group VIII. An election of species of Group I and second ingredient is further required.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-IX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The common structural feature linking the claims of O is not a contribution over the prior art. For example, US 5,332,720 teaches a genus of compounds of the formula

and US 6,008,230 teaches compounds including
$$z_1$$

Therefore, the technical feature linking the claims does not constitute a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2. Accordingly, the claims lack unity of invention, and restriction is proper.

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are listed in the specification as examples in the numerous tables.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

Application/Control Number: 10/564,511 Page 4

Art Unit: 1609

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

4. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the compounds are not obvious variants and belong to different art recognized classes. For example the

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/564,511

Art Unit: 1609

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result**

Application/Control Number: 10/564,511 Page 6

Art Unit: 1609

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Havlin whose telephone number is (571) 272-9066. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri., 7:30am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached at (571)-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert Havlin Examiner

RH

JANET L. ANDRES